

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-19 were pending in the present application. Claims 1, 3, 9-12, and 14 are amended herein. Accordingly, claims 1-19 are currently pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Applicants are submitting herewith replacement drawing sheets 1-5 to replace all prior drawing sheets. Applicants determined that Fig. 11 is on the same sheet as Fig. 12 in the originally filed drawings, but Fig. 11 appears on a different sheet with Fig. 10 on subsequently filed drawings. Therefore Applicants are submitting a complete set of replacement drawings to avoid any potential confusion. No amendments have been made to the figures. In addition, Applicants have amended several claims to correct minor typographical and grammatical errors. No new matter has been added to the claims.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art figures 1-6 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,327 (“Radi”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2143. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Without conceding the first and second criteria, Applicants respectfully assert that the references, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claims.

Independent claim 1 recites “correlating a received digital sample value with a plurality of other received digital sample values.” The Office Action acknowledges that Applicants’ prior art figures do not teach this element. Office Action, p. 3. Likewise, Radi does not teach or suggest this element. Applicants agree with the Office Action to the extent that Radi discloses a register 502 for holding a value read from frame buffer memory 206, a register 506 for holding the expanded bits of the current bit of frame set register (FSR) 512, and a comparator 504 comparing the values in register 502 and register 506. Radi, col. 9, l. 52-58. However, while register 502 may hold received data that is stored in frame buffer memory 206, register 506 and frame set register 512 do not store received digital values.

Radi actually discloses that the frame set register 512 (and in turn register 506) stores a “looked for version of said corresponding super frame data’s sequence of framing bits.” Radi, col. 10, l. 52-55. Radi further discloses that the frame set register is initially set to the appropriate framing value for the chosen mode. Radi, col. 7, l. 42-44. In other words, the “state machine is given a fsr [frame set register] value to find and sync up to.” Radi, col. 7, l. 63-64. Thus, it is clear that Radi discloses storing a desired value in frame set register 512, and does not teach or suggest storing a received digital value in the frame set register 512.

Because frame set register 512 and register 506 do not store received digital values, comparator 504 does not compare a received digital sample value with a plurality of other received digital sample values, as required by claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Applicants note that independent claim 9 and its dependent claim 10 are not addressed in the Office Action's rejections. If the same art was to be cited against these claims in a new Office Action, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 9 and 10 are patentable over the art for reasons similar to those given above because both claims recite "correlating a received digital sample value with a plurality of other received digital sample values."

The Office Action rejected claims 11 and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art figures 1-6 in view of Radi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,738,439 ("Okanoue"). The Office Action rejected claims 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art figures 1-6 in view of Radi and further in view of Okanoue and still further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0005378 ("Lee"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Independent claim 11 recites "correlating a received digital sample value with a plurality of other received digital sample values." Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 is patentable over the cited prior art for reasons similar to those given for claim 1 above, and because Okanoue does not teach or suggest this claim element.

Claims 12-19 depend from claim 11 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Steven A. Shaw, Applicants' Attorney, at 972-917-5137, so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. No fee is believed due in connection with this filing. However, should one be deemed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,

October 5, 2007  
Date

/Brian A. Carlson/  
Brian A. Carlson  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 37,793

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.  
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000  
Dallas, Texas 75252  
Tel.: 972-732-1001  
Fax: 972-732-9218